

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT NO. 09-006**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** **WARD GARFIELD SPECIFIC PLAN
(Huntington Beach RV Storage)**
- Concurrent Entitlements:** General Plan Amendment No. 09-002
Zoning Map Amendment No. 09-002
Zoning Text Amendment No. 09-007
Conditional Use Permit No. 09-024
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Huntington Beach
2000 Main Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
- Contact:** Jane James, Senior Planner
Phone: (714) 536-5271
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** Southeast corner of Garfield Avenue and Ward Street
(generally bounded by Ward Street, Garfield Avenue, Santa Ana River Channel, Arevalos Park and Mariner's Pointe Mobilehome Park)
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Huntington RV Storage, LLC
Contact Person: Doc Rivers
Phone: (805) 501-3508
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Existing: P (Public)
Proposed: P-sp (Public – Specific Plan)
- 6. ZONING:** Existing: RL (Residential Low Density)
Proposed: Ward Garfield Specific Plan No. 16
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Proposed Project

The Ward Garfield Specific Plan No. 16 development concept provides for a recreational vehicle storage facility within a portion of the SCE right-of-way that parallels the Santa Ana River Channel on the eastern boundary of the City. The development concept also recognizes the existing Village Nurseries, electrical substation and utilities, and wireless communication facilities.

The applicant requests a General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, Zoning Text Amendment, and Conditional Use Permit to adopt a new specific plan allowing for the establishment

of an Recreational Vehicle (RV) Storage facility on approximately 13.52 acres at the south end of the project site. The proposed project will also require submittal of a tentative and final parcel map to establish lease lines at the subject property. It is not necessary to process the subdivision at this time, but it will be required prior to issuance of a grading permit. Specifically, the applications proposed at this time are as follows:

General Plan Amendment No 09-002: To add a Specific Plan suffix (“sp”) to the existing Public land use designation

Zoning Map Amendment No. 09-002: To amend the zoning map from the current Residential Low Density designation to the Ward Garfield Specific Plan No. 16 designation.

Zoning Text Amendment No. 09-007: To establish the Ward Garfield Specific Plan No. 16 document.

Conditional Use Permit No. 09-024: To permit recreational vehicle storage on 13.52 acres of the total 43.60 acre specific plan area.

The proposed RV storage lot will consist of 557± RV parking spaces, a 480 sq. ft. modular rental office with restroom, and associated perimeter fencing and lighting. There will be a dump station for grey and black water, a vehicle washing area, and a trash enclosure inside the facility. Existing transmission towers and electrical lines will continue to exist throughout the RV parking facility. The recreational vehicles may include campers, motorhomes, boats, trailers, toy haulers, jet skis, and similar type vehicles and towing apparatus. Approximately six different parking stalls sizes will be provided throughout the site ranging in size from 10 ft. by 20 ft. to 11ft. by 40 ft. No on-site living in the vehicles will be permitted and no vehicular repair will be allowed on-site. Approximately one person will be employed during regular business hours while a second person will perform security duties at other hours.

The new RV Storage facility is designed to provide access from Ward Street with a large off-street queuing area to an automated remote gate system. The remote gate system will be designed to allow tenants to activate the gate opening at a substantial distance away, while still traveling on Ward Street, so that it is open when they actually arrive. Furthermore, the gate will be setback approximately 120 feet from the street so that at least three large motorhomes would be able to queue without impacting through traffic on Ward Street. Should the gate be closed and unopenable, vehicles are also provided with a sufficient turn around space to reenter the public street system without the need for backing up.

The proposed hours of operation for the RV storage office use are as follows:

Office Hours:

Sunday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM

Saturday from 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM

Remote Gate Access Hours:

Daily from 5:00 AM to 7:00 PM

Should a tenant desire to enter the site outside of the remote gate access hours, special arrangements may be made with the office personnel to accommodate those needs.

Approximately 8.8% of the site would be landscaped with the majority of the landscaping installed in more visible areas at the front entry and within the proposed ornamental fencing abutting existing residential properties. Construction is expected to take approximately two months.

The proposed Ward Garfield Specific Plan No. 16 proposes to designate three separate planning areas for the entire 43.60 acre site as follows:

Planning Area 1 (13.52 Acres): Huntington Beach RV Storage Facility

Planning Area 2 (12.95 Acres): Southern California Substation

Planning Area 3 (17.13 Acres): Village Nurseries

No changes to the hours of operation or the facility operations for Planning Area 2 or Planning Area 3 are proposed, other than to consolidate the current Village Nursery operations from Planning Area 1 to Planning Area 3.

Existing Conditions

The project site consists of approximately 43.60 acres at the southeast corner of Ward Street and Garfield Avenue at the east end of the city. The site is owned and operated by Southern California Edison (SCE) who currently leases portions of the property to landscape nursery uses. A subdivision will be required to establish lease lines for the current and proposed uses. The subject property is located on one parcel as well as a portion of a second parcel.

The approximately 13 acre Ellis Substation consists of transmission equipment and power distribution lines along with the substation office building. The onsite operations are power distribution services with approximately eight to ten employees. The facility is manned between 7:00AM and 5:00PM daily. The office building is approximately 2,000 square feet in size. A separate service truck parking building is also located on site. Access to the SCE substation is provided from Ward Street through the area leased to the nursery operation. No changes to the substation are proposed.

Village Nurseries Landscape Center has been in operation at the site since the 1970s (previously known as Nina's Nursery). The nursery has operated through 5-year renewable lease agreements with SCE and consists of wholesale of in ground and potted plants and trees. The business operates out of an open wood structure adjacent to two modular buildings joined to serve as an office. There are ten employees and laborers employed at the nursery.

The wholesale nursery is open daily to the public with hours of operation generally between 7:00AM and 5:00PM. Customer access is provided from Garfield Avenue with business related access from Ward Street. On-site parking is currently provided along Garfield Avenue for approximately 20 cars. In addition, equipment stored at the site consists of cart movers, small trucks, and delivery equipment.

Village Nurseries will consolidate their operation into the area surrounding the SCE substation in order to accommodate the new recreational vehicle storage operation. No additional facilities are proposed for the nursery operation.

- 8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** The site is surrounded by the Orange County Sanitation District uses to the north across Garfield Avenue (City of Fountain Valley); the Santa Ana River Channel to the east; Arevalos Park and single family residences to the south; Mariner's Pointe Mobilehome Park to the southwest; and single family residences to the west across Ward Street.
- 9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:** None
- 10. OTHER AGENCIES WHO'S APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED)** (i.e. permits, financing approval, or participating agreement): California Public Utilities Commission

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☒

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or a “potentially significant unless mitigated impact” on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. ☐

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required**. ☐

Signature

Jane James

Printed Name

Date

Senior Planner

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. “Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVIII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach’s requirements.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval and Code Requirements - The City imposes standard conditions of approval and code requirements on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions and code requirements identified in the discussions has been provided as Attachment No. 4.)

SAMPLE QUESTION:

<i>ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant</i>			
	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)

☐☐☐☒

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 2, 5, 23) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The subject property is currently designated as Public (P) in the City’s General Plan and RL (Residential Low Density) in the Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision Ordinance (HBZSO). The existing land uses include an electrical substation and a landscape nursery business under the existing electrical transmission lines. Southern California Edison, a public utility company and the landowner of the subject site, has authorized submittal of the application to the City of Huntington Beach. The applicant is simultaneously applying to SCE for approval of the proposed improvements for RV storage. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with any policies or regulations of SCE.

The proposed RV Storage lot will require a General Plan Amendment to add a specific plan suffix and Zoning Map and Zoning Text Amendments to establish a specific plan to allow the additional use. The project proponent wishes to establish recreational vehicle storage under the existing overhead power lines. Southern California Edison (SEC) does not permit construction of permanent improvements beneath the power lines but storage of movable vehicles would be allowed so SCE access to the electrical can always be maintained. According to General Plan Table LU-3, the specific plan overlay, “Permits underlying land uses and requires that a Specific or Development Plan be formulated for large scale, mixed-use multi-phased development projects which provides greater specificity for land use and infrastructure plans, design, and development standards, and phasing/implementation.”

Maintaining the current Public General Plan Land Use designation and adding the specific plan suffix is consistent with the following General Plan goals objectives, and policies:

Land Use Element

Objective LU13.1: Provide for the continuation of existing and development of new uses, such as governmental administrative, public safety, human service, cultural, educational, infrastructure, religious, and other uses that support the needs of existing and future residents and businesses.

Utilities Element

Objective U5.1: Ensure that adequate natural gas, telecommunication, and electrical systems are provided.

Policy U5.1.4: Require the review of new and or expansions of existing industrial and utility facilities to ensure that such facilities will not visually impair the City’s coastal corridors and entry nodes.

The proposed project adds a vehicle storage use beneath the existing overhead power lines without disrupting SCE’s ability to provide service to its customers. Additionally the proposed use will not visually impair coastal areas or entry nodes as the site is located on the eastern edge of the City, away from visually sensitive areas.

The HBZSO classifies recreational vehicle storage under the Commercial land use category as follows:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Vehicle Storage . The business of storing or safekeeping of operative and inoperative vehicles for periods of time greater than a 24 hour period, including, but not limited to, the storage of parking tow-aways, impound yards, and storage lots for automobiles, trucks, buses and recreational vehicles, but not including vehicle dismantling.

The HBZSO allows Vehicle Storage uses in both General Commercial and Industrial zoning categories. The specific plan is proposed to allow very specific uses on the property and to exclude other typical commercial and industrial uses because they would be not be appropriate adjacent to the residential and park uses nearby. The specific plan limits the allowable land uses to electrical substation and utilities, landscape nursery, RV storage, and wireless communication facilities. The other uses described above in the Vehicle Storage category, such as storage of parking tow-aways and impound yards, would not be permitted.

Development of the property under the existing Residential Low Density zoning is not likely as SCE has not indicated any proposal to remove or relocate the existing electrical utilities in the near future. Additionally, due to the unique narrow and long shape of the property and limited access to the public street system, residential development would be difficult to achieve. Thus, development of the property to the current RL zoning is not reasonably foreseeable.

The project site is not subject to provisions of the City's Local Coastal Program as the property is not located within the coastal zone boundaries. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is proposed in an urbanized area and will coincide with existing electrical utilities. The project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan of the City of Huntington Beach, as there are no such plans adopted for the area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 4, 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed development will occur on an existing parcel with direct access to an existing public street. No public access ways through the subject property exist. No new roadways, rail lines, bridges or other off-site improvements with the potential to physically divide an established community are proposed or required for the specific plan. The project does require dedication and improvement along the east side of Ward Avenue between the site entrance and Garfield Avenue. An existing dirt right-of-way will be improved with sidewalk, curb, gutter, and bike lane. A second travel lane and a striped median will be added, however the roadway improvements will not physically divide an established community. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 5, 15, 23) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: The proposed project will result in the establishment of a new RV storage facility that will not stimulate population growth in the area. The new business will provide storage facilities for existing RV owners in the area and no impact to population growth is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 5, 23) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 5, 23) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: b) – c) The project site is currently occupied by the Ellis electrical substation and Village Nurseries Landscape Center. The proposed project provides for the establishment of a new RV Storage facility on a portion of the nursery. No residential uses or structures exist on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace existing housing or inhabitants and no impacts are anticipated.

III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault ? (Sources: 1, 14, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: According to the Limited Geotechnical Report by TGR Geotechnical, Inc., received and dated August 24, 2009, the project site is not known to be traversed by an active fault and is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest faults are the San Joaquin Hills Blind Thrust Fault located 0.5 miles away and the Newport-Inglewood fault located approximately 2.5 miles southwest of the project site. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 14, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. Therefore, the site could be subjected to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures built in Huntington Beach are required to comply with standards set forth in the California Building Code (CBC) and standard City codes, policies and procedures which require submittal of a detailed soils analysis prepared by a Licensed Soils Engineer. The required soils analysis must include on-site soil sampling and laboratory testing of materials to provide detailed recommendations regarding grading, foundations, retaining walls, streets, utilities, and chemical and fill properties of underground items including buried pipe and concrete and the protection thereof; and a report prepared by an engineering geologist indicating the ground surface acceleration from earth movement for the subject property. All structures shall be constructed in compliance with the g-factors as indicated by the geologist's report. Calculations for footings and structural members to withstand anticipated g-factors must be submitted to the City for review prior to the issuance of building permits. Conformance with

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

CBC requirements and standard City code requirements will ensure potential impacts from seismic ground shaking are reduced to a less than significant level.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 14, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Liquefaction is a seismic phenomenon in which loose, saturated, fine-grained granular soils behave similarly to a fluid when subjected to high-intensity ground shaking. Liquefaction occurs when these ground conditions exist: 1) Shallow groundwater; 2) Low density, fine, clean sandy soils; and 3) High-intensity ground motion. These soils may acquire a high degree of mobility, which can lead to lateral movement, sliding, consolidation and settlement of loose sediments, sand boils and other damaging deformations. This phenomenon occurs only below the water table, but, after liquefaction has developed, it can propagate upward into overlying non-saturated soil as excess pore water dissipates. One of the primary factors controlling the potential for liquefaction is depth to groundwater. Typically, liquefaction has a low potential where groundwater is greater than 40-feet deep and is virtually unknown below 60 feet.

The subject site is located in an area of high to very high potential for liquefaction according to Figure EH-7 of the General Plan (1996) and the TGR Geotechnical Report. Other published data (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Official Map, Newport Beach Quadrangle) from the California Division of Mines and Geology, published in April 7, 1997, indicates that the project site is located in an area identified as having a potential for soil liquefaction. However, the proposed improvements to the area primarily include surface RV parking and one 480 square foot modular building for daytime office use. As described in Section III a) ii) above, construction will comply with CBC standards to reduce impacts to less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 14, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: According to the City of Huntington Beach General Plan, the site is not in an area susceptible to slope instability. The site is on a flat parcel of land and although a minor slope abuts the property to the east along the flood control channel, no significant slopes or other landforms susceptible to landslides exist in the vicinity of the property. Moreover, the California Division of Mines and Geology has not mapped any earthquake-induced landslides at, or in the vicinity of, the site which would be indicative of the potential for slope instability at or in the vicinity of the site. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project and vicinity are urbanized and have relatively flat topography. The project site has been previously graded and developed with structures, parking surfaces and roadways. Although the proposed project has the potential to result in erosion of soils during construction activities, erosion will be minimized by compliance with standard City requirements for submittal of an erosion control plan prior to issuance of building permits, for review and approval by the Department of Public Works. Implementation of the proposed project would not require significant alteration of the existing topography of the project site. Less than significant impacts would occur and no mitigation measures would be required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
(Sources: 1, 14, 17)

Discussion: Refer to Responses III.a) iii) and III.a) iv) for discussion of liquefaction and landslides, respectively. Subsidence is large-scale settlement of the ground surface generally caused by withdrawal of groundwater or oil in sufficient quantities such that the surrounding ground surface sinks over a broad area. Withdrawal of groundwater, oil, or other mineral resources would not occur as part of the proposed project and, therefore, subsidence is not anticipated to occur. Adherence to the design recommendations of soils studies and grading plans as required by the City will ensure that no or less than significant geology related impacts will occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 17) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located in an area of moderate to high expansive soil conditions (Figure EH-12, City of Huntington Beach General Plan). Proposed improvements associated with the project include an asphalt parking area, a small modular office building, landscaping and perimeter fencing. All improvements will be required to comply with standard conditions of approval including submittal and approval of grading plans. All impacts from expansive soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Sources: 1, 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department has determined that the public sewer system can accommodate the proposed development. No septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems are necessary.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Water quality standards and waste discharge requirements will be addressed in the project design and development phase pursuant to a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP), prepared by a Civil or Environmental Engineer in accordance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and approved by the City of Huntington Beach Department of Public Works. The SWPPP and WQMP will establish Best Management Practices (BMPs) for construction and post-construction operation of the facility, including source, site and treatment controls to be installed and maintained at the site. The WQMP and SWPPP are standard requirements for development in the City of Huntington Beach, and with implementation, will ensure compliance with water quality standards and water discharge requirements, which will reduce project impacts to a level that is less than significant. A Preliminary WQMP has been submitted by the applicant, which identifies source, site and treatment controls for the reduction of pollutants to the surrounding water sources such as landscaped areas, use of low maintenance vegetation and installation of natural filter systems. As described in Section IV c-e) below, the

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

applicant proposes to install three gravel infiltration pits to serve as both a water quality BMP and detention for 100-year storm events. Because the proposed RV storage site consists primarily of a parking lot for stored vehicles, leaking oil may occur and collect on the asphalt. The Preliminary WQMP proposes that run-off from the parking lot will enter a vegetative strip for pre-treatment prior to entering the gravel pit for percolation.

Final WQMP and SWPPP must be approved prior to issuance of grading permits. In addition, the Department of Public Works has identified numerous standard requirements applicable to the various project components, including the proposed parking areas and RV dump station to ensure no significant impact to water quality would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Huntington Beach Public Works Department prepared a Master Plan for the City's water system in 2000. The Master Plan addresses water supply issues within the City and pertinent surrounding areas. The Utilities Division of the Public Works Department has reviewed the project plans and did not identify any concerns regarding impacts to ground water supplies or groundwater recharge due to the nature of the proposed uses. The project would likely result in a decrease in water consumption previously planned for in the Master Plan as the residential zoning designation will be eliminated and replaced with four specific uses. All four specific land uses are lower in water consumption rates than single family residential and, therefore, do not present a significant impact to water supplies. In addition, the project is subject to compliance with the City's Water Ordinance, including the Water Efficient Landscape Requirements, as well as Title 24 conservation measures such as low flow fixtures, which ensure water consumption is minimized. The estimated water demand for the proposed project can be accommodated by the City's water service capacity and does not represent a significant impact.

Based on the Fire Department's requirement for a private on-site fire hydrant system, a hydraulic water analysis is required to identify any off-site water improvements necessary to adequately protect the property per the Fire Department requirements. If necessary, the applicant shall be required to upgrade/improve the City's water system per Water Standards to meet the water demands to the site and/or mitigate the impacts of the property at no cost to the City. The applicant shall provide the City with a site plan showing the existing and proposed on-site and off-site water improvements (including pipelines sizes, fire hydrants, meters, and backflow device locations). The applicant shall be responsible to pay the City for performing the analysis using the City's hydraulic water model. Based on standard conditions of approval, the water model shall be completed prior to submittal of final parcel map. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 4, 5, 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 4, 5, 19, 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 19, 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: (c-e) The project site, in its existing condition, is almost entirely pervious with the landscape nursery business occupying the majority of the site. The proposed RV Storage facility will include the installation of approximately 10-11 acres of asphalt for the parking and access to the recreational vehicles stalls.

The existing drainage pattern of the site is divided into three sub-areas. One, E1, at the very entrance of the site along Ward Street is approximately 1 acre of self-contained drainage. This 1 acre drains towards two Edison towers located near the center of this drainage area. Drainage is collected and infiltrated into the gravel area surrounding each of these towers. The second drainage sub-area, E2, contains approximately 3.5 acres and is located at the northeast portion of the site. Much like sub-area E1, E2 drains toward two Edison towers located near the center of the sub-area where drainage is collected and infiltrated into the gravel surrounding each of the towers. The final drainage sub-area, E3, drains toward the east property line where it eventually infiltrates into the existing soil. Because there are no drainage devices located on the existing property, ponding does occur during larger storms.

The proposed post-development drainage pattern is very similar to the existing drainage pattern, except drainage will be directed away from the Edison towers and drainage devices will be added to the project to aid in the infiltration process. The proposed drainage pattern will be subject to City of Huntington Beach Department of Public Works approval. Area P1, at the very entrance of the site will use curb and gutter to direct drainage towards Ward Street. Area P2, containing the northeast portion of the site, will collect drainage through v-gutters that will then direct the flows to an infiltration trench located along the eastern property line of the project. The final drainage sub-area, P3, drains toward the east property line where an infiltration trench will collect all of the runoff from this sub-area.

The proposed grading for this project was designed to limit the offsite runoff to less than that of the existing condition, while adding Best Management Practices (BMPs) to achieve the necessary stormwater and water quality requirements.

The project site is bordered to the east by the Santa Ana River Channel maintained by the Orange County Flood Control District. No direct connection to the channel is proposed. Although the existing drainage pattern is expected to be altered during the construction phase, erosion and siltation during construction will be minimized to a less than significant level by employing Best Management Practices (BMPs) for erosion control, pursuant to a City approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP). Required SWPPP, WQMP and hydrology and hydraulic studies, to be submitted in accordance with City of Huntington Beach standard development requirements, will identify BMPs for construction and operation ensuring no significant impact associated with polluted runoff. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 19, 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a).				
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 5, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project site consists of electrical utilities, a landscape nursery and a proposed RV parking facility. No housing is proposed. The subject site is designated as Flood Zone X on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), which is not subject to Federal Flood Development restrictions and no impacts are anticipated.				
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 5, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project site is designated as Flood Zone X in the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), which is not subject to Federal Flood Development restrictions. The project site is not situated within the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped in the FIRM and no impacts are anticipated.				
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is not located within a flood hazard zone. The site, along with the entire eastern end of the city is bordered to the east by the Santa Ana River Channel maintained by the Orange County Flood Control District. While the project includes storage of recreational vehicles and one small office building, no on-site living or residential uses will be permitted. There are no impacts anticipated from the failure of a levee or dam.				
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 7, 14, 16)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The elevation of the site above mean sea level (approximately 20 feet) and its distance from the ocean (approximately 3 ½ miles) and other large bodies of water suggest that the probability of experiencing adverse effects from tsunamis and seiches is low at the site. According to Figure EH-8 of the General Plan the site is not located within a potential tsunami run-up area and no impacts are anticipated.				
k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 19, 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a) and IV(e).				
l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

construction activities? (Sources: 19, 20)

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a) and IV(e).

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed RV parking lot will introduce vehicle fuels onto the project site in a different way than the landscape nursery previously used the site. The parked vehicles will contain vehicle fuel in the fuel tanks but no fueling systems are proposed in conjunction with the storage facility. A vehicle wash station and a dump station for gray and black water are proposed. The City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department has indicated that the vehicle wash station must be directed to the sanitary sewer (upon approval by the Orange County Sanitation District), to an engineered infiltration system, or to an equally effective alternative. The dump station must tie directly to the sanitary sewer. In accordance with standard City of Huntington Beach development requirements, hydrology and hydraulic studies for both on-site and off-site facilities, Storm Drain, Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPP) and Water Quality Management Plans (WQMP) conforming with the current National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, prepared by a Licensed Civil Engineer, shall be submitted to the Department of Public Works for review and approval. Specific requirements and measures to be incorporated into the required studies and plans are identified in Attachment No. 4, City Policies, Standard Plans, and Code Requirements of the Huntington Beach Zoning & Subdivision Ordinance and Municipal Code. Refer to response in Section IV(a) for further discussion. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(a) and IV(e).

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(e).

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 19, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion under Section IV(e).

V. **AIR QUALITY.** The City has identified the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district as appropriate to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 9, 21)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section V.e. below.				
b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 4, 9, 21)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section V.e. below.				
c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 5, 6)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section V.e. below.				
d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 9, 21)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion under Section V.e. below.				
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 9, 21)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion:

Discussion a – e: The proposed project consists of development of an approximately 13-acre parcel for a 557-space RV storage facility and associated site improvements. The City of Huntington Beach is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is regulated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The entire Basin is designated as a national-level nonattainment area for Ozone, Carbon Monoxide (CO), respirable particulate matter (PM₁₀) and fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}). The Basin is also a State-level nonattainment area for Ozone, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Sensitive receptors in the area include residents in nearby developments west as well as recreation users of the trail to the east and park and school uses to the southwest. The proposed zoning text amendment will not have any impacts on air quality.

Impacts from objectionable odors could potentially occur during construction of the project. However, impacts would be intermittent and short-term and would not persist once construction was completed. Vehicle storage uses in general are not sources of objectionable odors. Potential odors would be limited to the gray and black water dump station, which is tied by vacuum seal directly to the sanitary sewer and located at the northeast corner of the property, away from sensitive uses. Other potential odors would be limited to typical office use wastes, which are stored in refuse containers and picked up on a weekly basis. As such, impacts from odors would be less than significant.

The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is the region's applicable air quality plan and was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under jurisdiction of the SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

considered to be consistent with the General Plan are considered to be consistent with the AQMP. Although the proposed project is proposing a general plan amendment to add the specific plan overlay, there is no additional growth in population size and no additional residential units as a result of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the AQMP and impacts would be less than significant.

Short-term: The construction of the project may result in short-term air pollutant emissions from the following activities: the commute of workers to and from the project site; dismantling of shade structures at the landscape nursery; relocation of boxed nursery material from Planning Area 1 to Planning Area 3; grading activities; delivery and minimal hauling of construction materials and supplies to and from the project site; fuel combustion by on-site construction equipment; and dust generating activities from soil disturbance. Emissions during construction were calculated using URBEMIS2007 program (version 9.2.4). The allotment of equipment to be utilized during each phase was based on defaults in the URBEMIS2007 program and was modified as needed to represent the specifics of the proposed project.

The URBEMIS model calculates total emissions, on-site and offsite, resulting from each construction activity which are compared to the SCAQMD Regional Thresholds. A comparison of the project's total emissions with the regional thresholds is provided below. A project with daily construction emission rates below these thresholds is considered to have a less than significant effect on regional air quality.

SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance - Construction						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂
Estimated Construction Emissions for proposed project	26.89	6.07	50.05	91.76	20.95	0.01
Significance Threshold	550	75	100	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Based on the aforementioned table construction of the project would not exceed the regional emissions thresholds nor would it expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

SCAQMD Regional Pollutant Emission Thresholds of Significance – Operations						
	Regional Significance Threshold (Lbs/day)					
	CO	VOC	NOx	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	SO ₂
Estimated Operational Emissions for proposed project	270.91	21.21	51.07	1.85	1.13	0.25
Significance Threshold	550	55	55	150	55	150
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Long-term: Post-construction emissions were also calculated using the URBEMIS2007 program version (9.4.2). The program was set to calculate emissions for the proposed 557-space RV storage lot. The default URBEMIS2007 variables were used for the calculations.

Based on the aforementioned table post-construction emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the regional thresholds nor would it expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, a less than significant impact is anticipated.

In addition, the project does not come close to exceeding established thresholds for any pollutant including the identified nonattainment pollutants (Ozone, CO, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) and ozone precursors (NO_x and VOC) both for construction and post-construction and therefore, would not contribute a cumulatively considerable increase in these pollutants.

Greenhouse Gases

AB 32 codifies the state's goal to reduce its global warming by requiring that the state's greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. This reduction will be accomplished through an enforceable statewide cap on greenhouse gas emissions that will be phased in starting in 2012. In order to effectively implement the cap, AB 32 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop appropriate regulations and establish a mandatory reporting system to track and monitor greenhouse gas emissions levels. In addition, the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has until January 1, 2010 to adopt CEQA guidelines for evaluation of greenhouses gases. A draft of the proposed amendments to the CEQA guidelines was released in April 2009 and states that a local agency must develop its own significance criteria based on local conditions, data and guidance from other sources.

The proposed project would result in a total of approximately 34.19 tons of CO₂ emissions during construction. Post-construction CO₂ emissions would be approximately 4,502.22 tons/year. Therefore, the project would produce GHG emissions. Other GHG emissions could result from increases in electricity and natural gas usage and solid waste production, all of which would minimally occur with the proposed project. Although, the amount of post-construction GHG emissions from the project (4,502.22 tons/yr) represents a negligible percentage of the overall state of California GHG emissions (484,400,000 tons/yr - 2004), since there are no thresholds of significance established yet, any contribution of GHG emissions can be considered significant.

The proposed project incorporates design features that promote energy efficiency and a reduction in GHG emissions, both directly and indirectly. For instance, the project is proposing to utilize a storm drain system designed to capture high-volume and low-volume flows and allow them to percolate into the ground thereby reducing the amount of water that enters the storm drain system and drought tolerant landscaping. In addition, the project is required to comply with all applicable City codes and requirements pertaining to energy efficiency and water use efficiency as well as applicable requirements for construction equipment that would limit truck and equipment idling times, exhaust and dust. The identified project design features and applicable requirements are consistent with the GHG reduction strategies recommended by the California Climate Action Team (CCAT), the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) and the California Attorney General's office. Therefore, due to the project's small contribution to GHG emissions in addition to project design features that would reduce GHG emissions, impacts would be less than significant.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

street system (e.g., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections? (Sources: 1, 11, 22)

Discussion: The project's potential to generate a substantial increase in traffic was assessed by comparing a similar RV Storage facility in Anaheim (Anaheim RV Storage) owned and operated by the proponent. The Huntington Beach facility is proposed to operate similarly to the Anaheim facility with the difference being capacity. The Anaheim facility has a capacity for 288 RV spaces while the Huntington Beach facility proposes 557 spaces or just under double the size.

The analysis concludes that the proposed project is anticipated to generate approximately 160 net new weekday daily vehicle trips, a maximum of 12 net new weekday AM peak hour vehicle trips, and a maximum of 20 net new weekday PM peak hour vehicle trips. The weekend operations result in an average of approximately 58 vehicle trips generated per weekend day with an average of three AM peak hour trips and 10 PM peak hour trips. The projected traffic generation rates do not exceed the applicable City of Huntington Beach and State of California Department of Transportation Engineers (Caltrans) traffic impact thresholds (100 peak hour trips) for requiring a Traffic Impact Study. Accordingly, based on City of Huntington Beach and Caltrans traffic impact analysis guidelines, no significant increase in traffic is expected as a result of the proposed project.

Based on information in the City's General Plan and Department of Public Works, Traffic Division, the adjacent intersection (Garfield Avenue and Ward Street) currently operates at LOS B during the AM peak hour and LOS C during the PM peak hour. The segment of Ward Street between Yorktown Avenue and Garfield Avenue, operates at LOS B, while the segment of Garfield Avenue between Brookhurst Street and Ward Street operates at LOS C. The City's current policy for acceptable level of service at traffic-controlled intersections is LOS D; and LOS C for roadway segment links. This project is forecast to generate 160 new daily trips, which will not result in a change in LOS at any of the surrounding intersections or street segments and they will continue to operate at acceptable LOS standards. The project will be subject to payment of traffic impact fees for each net new added daily trip.

Construction traffic resulting from development of the project may result in short-term interruptions to traffic circulation, including pedestrian and bicycle flow. Additionally, relocation of shade structures and potted landscape materials from Planning Area 1 to Planning Area 3 will result in an increase in truck trips on a short term basis. The relocation of the nursery and consolidation of nursery operations within Planning Area 3 is expected to last approximately one week. Based on the scope of the RV storage construction, approximately two months duration, the short-term interruptions to traffic are not considered to be significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources:1, 11, 22) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Please refer to discussion item VI (a) above.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Although the City is located within the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within the height restricted boundaries identified in the Airport

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant			
	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Environs Land Use Plan or within two miles of any known public or private airstrip. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impacts would occur.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses? (Sources: 5)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located at the intersection of two existing arterial highways that provide access to the site. No new roadways or intersections are proposed although improvements to Ward Street will be required. The project is subject to compliance with City standards for vision clearance at street/driveway intersections, minimum drive aisle widths and truck turning radii designed to ensure hazards are minimized, as well as a Traffic Construction Mitigation Plan during construction of the project. The project's proposed driveway access and on-site and off-site circulation has been evaluated by the Departments of Fire, Planning and Public Works and with the required Ward Avenue improvements, found to be consistent with City standards for safe access and circulation.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 5)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed site plan has been reviewed by the Departments of Fire and Public Works for conformance with City requirements for emergency access. The project's proposed driveway access and on-site circulation has been found to be consistent with City standards for emergency access and circulation. During construction, construction equipment and construction worker's vehicles will be contained on-site and will not block streets or potentially impede emergency access. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? (Sources: 2, 5, 23)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed RV storage project results in a low demand for parking spaces. Recreational vehicle users typically drive a passenger vehicle to the lot, pull out the recreational vehicle and park the passenger vehicle in the space until return from their trip. Alternatively, vehicles may enter the site, hook-up the recreation vehicle trailer or toy hauler and leave the site. Therefore, additional parking spaces for the vehicle storage area are not necessary. Parking adjacent to the office building for visitors, potential customers, one employee, and patrolling security personnel is necessary. Accordingly, five parking spaces are provided adjacent to the office building and will be sufficient for the anticipated demand. The proposed project complies with parking requirements specified in the Ward Garfield Specific Plan and will not result in an inadequate parking capacity. No variances to parking standards are proposed or required, and no unique circumstances exist that would suggest that the minimum parking standards applicable to the project are inadequate. Accordingly, no parking related impacts are anticipated.

- g) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1, 2, 23)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: The proposed development does not exceed the thresholds established in Section 230.36 of the HBZSO – *Transportation Demand Management*, based on employment generation factors contained therein and the applicant's employment projections. The thresholds established in Section 230.36 serve as a basis to identify projects with the potential for significant traffic and air quality impacts and which warrant implementation of transportation demand strategies. According to Section 231.20 of the HBZSO, the proposed RV storage project would require 23 bicycle parking stalls. However, that standard is based on commercial and industrial business with up to 50,000 square feet of building area and one bike stall is required for every 25 parking spaces. In this case, a high demand of bicycle riders to the RV storage lot is not anticipated, therefore, the minimum of three bicycle racks as required by the HBZSO should be sufficient. No impacts are anticipated.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 10, 18) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site and all surrounding properties are currently developed with quasi-public, residential, and public park land uses. The project site does not support any unique, sensitive, or endangered species and is not shown in the General Plan as a generalized habitat area.

The applicant commissioned a Fairy Shrimp Habitat Assessment by Bonterra Consulting (December 1, 2009) to determine whether the project site supported potential fairy shrimp habitat. The assessment concluded that there was no natural ponding identified that would support fairy shrimp, and that other than runoff from the existing landscape nursery irrigation system, there was no substantial habitat to support the Riverside or San Diego fairy shrimp. Less than significant impacts to biological resources are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is currently occupied by the Ellis Substation and Village Nursery Landscape Center. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service. The project will not result in any loss to endangered or sensitive animal or bird species and does not conflict with any habitat conservation plans.

See Discussion VII. (a) above. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion: The project does not contain any wetlands; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project area is surrounded by residential and quasi-public uses. The site does not support any fish or wildlife and will not interfere with the movement of any fish or wildlife species nor impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site contains an existing landscape nursery that will be relocated to a smaller area of the site. The site does not contain any trees which may be considered mature and which could be impacted by construction. Construction of the project will be subject to standard requirements for the submittal of a landscape plan. No other biological resources exist on the site.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site does not support any unique or endangered plant or animal species and is not a part of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; therefore, no impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource. The project site is not designated as a known mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion: The project site is not designated as an important mineral resource recovery site in the General Plan or any other land use plan. Development of the project is not anticipated to have any impact on any mineral resource recovery. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 3, 6, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The SCE substation, towers, and electrical transmission lines will remain in place and continue to operate as they do today. The landscape nursery will be consolidated from its current location on the site to a smaller portion of the site and will then continue its existing operation. The RV storage project will not engage in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, the stored vehicles will contain vehicle fuel in their fuel tanks and the site will offer a vacuum sealed dump station for gray and black water. The dump station will be tied directly to the sanitary sewer, subject to approval by the Orange County Sanitation District. In any event, all hazardous materials use and storage are subject to review by the Departments of Building & Safety and Fire in conjunction with standard building permit and certificate of occupancy inspection processes. Refer to Section IV a) and c-e) for further discussion on hazardous material related to water quality. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 6, 13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located in a methane district. No impacts resulting from hazards involving the release of hazardous materials during construction or during operation of the facility is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The southern portion of the project site is located adjacent to Arevalos Park, which abuts the existing Pegasus School site. The SCE substation, towers, and electrical transmission lines will remain in place and continue to operate as they do today. The landscape nursery will be consolidated from its current location on the site to a smaller portion of the site and will then continue its existing operation. No acutely hazardous emissions, substances or waste will be emitted or handled during operations of the RV Storage facility. Development of the RV storage lot and consolidation activities of Village Nurseries will be required to comply with Fire Department specifications. Vehicle fuel will be present on-site while the business is in operation, however, it will be contained within the parked vehicles, no on-site fueling station is proposed as part of the facility, and less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 13)

Discussion: The site is not listed on the State's Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 10, 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Although the City is located within the Planning Area for the Joint Force Training Center, Los Alamitos, the project site is not located within the height restricted boundaries identified in the Airport Environs Land Use Plan or within two miles of any known public or private airstrip. The proposed project does not propose any structures with heights that would interfere with existing airspace or flight patterns. No impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 10, 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located near any private airstrips. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1, 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the Fire Department and is designed to be in compliance with fire access and circulation requirements. The specific plan and proposed development of a portion of the site will not interfere or conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No impacts are anticipated to any emergency response or evacuation plans.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is located in an urbanized area and is not near any wildlands. No impacts are anticipated.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 10)

Discussion: Refer to Section (d) below.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Refer to Section (d) below.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Refer to Section (d) below.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: a) – d)

The SCE substation, towers, and electrical transmission lines will remain in place and continue to operate as they do today. The landscape nursery will be consolidated from its current location on the site to a smaller portion of the site and will then continue its existing operation.

The RV storage project will generate short-term noise impacts during construction, including noise generated by earth-moving equipment, trucks and power tools. However, the project will be subject to compliance with Chapter 8.40 – *Noise*, of the Huntington Beach Municipal Code which restricts all construction activities to the hours between 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM Monday - Saturday. Construction activities are prohibited Sundays and Federal holidays. Accordingly, construction related noise impacts are expected to be less than significant.

The project's potential to generate noise related impacts after completion of construction include the vehicle trips to and from the RV storage facility. The noise levels from the RV's are anticipated to be below City of Huntington Beach daytime (7:00AM to 10:00PM) noise ordinance limits for anticipated daytime noise sources.

The facility will not be in operation during nighttime hours. Standard office hours are 8:00AM to 5:00PM (Sunday-Friday); 7:00AM to 6:00PM (Saturday). Remote gate hours will be programmed from 5:00AM to 7:00PM, allowing tenants to enter the site to store or retrieve vehicles. The tenants will access the facility with a remote control transmitter to open the gate while still on Ward Street. The remote system allows efficient access to the site and eliminates vehicle idling noise within the driveway approach at the site entrance. No amplified or pager system is proposed, therefore minimizing annoyance to adjacent residences. Additionally, no vehicular repair or living within the vehicles will be permitted. Noise impacts are expected to be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 10, 12)

Discussion: The City of Huntington Beach is included in the Planning Area for the Joint Forces Training Center in Los Alamitos. However, the site is located a considerable distance from the Training Center, such that the project would not be impacted by flight activity and noise generation from the Center. No impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 10, 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts are anticipated.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police Protection? (Sources:1, 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a)-b) The proposed project has been reviewed by Huntington Beach Fire Department and Police Department staff. The project site is located approximately one and one-half miles from the Bushard Fire Station and approximately three miles from the Main Police Station. Estimated emergency first response times are within the 80 percent/Five minute response time objective established in the City's Growth Management Element. Estimated emergency first response times from the Main Police Station are within acceptable service levels. The proposed project can be adequately served by existing Fire and Police protection service levels. Because the site is currently developed with a landscape nursery and electrical utilities, the City already provides service. The addition of the RV storage lot to the specific plan area is expected to slightly increase service demand for the project site. However, this increase is expected to be minimal and less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Schools? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will provide for continued operation of existing uses on the project site and the proposed RV Storage facility. No significant increase in the number of persons employed at the site is planned or anticipated. The applicant will also be required to pay school district fees for the net increase in the floor area proposed. Based on the negligible increase of employees and the requirement for payment of school fees, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Parks? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not expected to have any significant impact on park facilities, since the proposed

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

project will provide for operation of low level commercial uses and existing utilities. No significant increase in the number of people employed at the site is planned or anticipated. The project will be subject to payment of park fees in compliance with the HBZSO. No significant impacts to park services are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Other public facilities or governmental services?
(Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the various City Departments, including Public Works, Building and Safety, Fire, Police and Planning for compliance with all applicable City codes. With implementation of recommended conditions of approval, and compliance with City specifications, no significant impacts to public services are anticipated.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
(Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 10, Dept. of Public Works) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 10, Dept. of Public Works) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 10, Dept. of Public Works) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Sources: 1, 10, Dept. of Public Works) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 19, 20)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: a)-h) The project will provide for the continued operation of the Ellis Substation and the Village Nurseries Landscape Center together with the establishment of a new RV Storage facility. The new RV facility is expected to result in a decrease in the total number of people employed at the site as the size of the landscape nursery will be reduced by approx. 14 acres. There will not be an increase the amount of wastewater or solid waste generated at the site, however, the City of Huntington Beach Public Works Department has determined that currently there are no public sanitary sewer facilities on Ward Street in the project vicinity to serve the development. A public sanitary sewer main shall be designed and constructed to run southerly on Ward Street to Sunday Drive and turn westerly to connect to the manhole just west of the intersection of Ward Street and Sunday Drive.

The developer shall be required to submit a hydrology and hydraulic study for both on-site and off-site facilities and a project WQMP for review and approval by the Public Works Department. The studies and the proposed drainage improvements shall include on-site, privately maintained Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control the quality of run-off water from the development. All utility connections to the project site will be in accordance with applicable City standards.

Solid waste collection service for the City of Huntington Beach is provided by Rainbow Disposal, under an exclusive long-term contract with the City. Collected solid waste is transported to a transfer station where the solid waste is sorted and processed through a Materials Recovery Facility where recyclable materials are removed. The remaining solid waste is transferred to the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill located in the City of Irvine. The landfill has a remaining capacity in excess of 30 years based on the present solid waste generation rates, and the project is not expected to generate a substantial amount of daily waste products in the long term nor as a result of construction. Based on this and the nature of uses proposed, the project is not anticipated to noticeably impact the capacity of existing landfills that will serve the use and the project will be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The 2000 City of Huntington Beach Water Master Plan analyzes demands and anticipated impacts of future developments based on the Land Use Element designations. The proposed project includes a request to amend the General Plan, establish a specific plan designation, and eliminate the current RL Low Density Residential zoning designation. The proposed specific plan limits the allowable on-site land uses to four distinct uses: electrical substation and utilities, landscape nursery, RV storage, and wireless communication facilities. These limited uses result in a significantly less demand on water resources than the approximately 91 single family residential units that would be permitted under the current zoning. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
(Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project site is not situated adjacent to or in the vicinity of any scenic vista designated by the City or the State. As a result, no impacts are expected.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is not adjacent to a state scenic highway, nor are there any significant trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings in the vicinity of the subject site. No impacts will result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The site is adjacent to the existing Mariner's Pointe mobile home park and existing single family residences that currently view the landscape nursery and electrical transmission towers and lines. The SCE substation will continue its current operation and will not result in any changed visual character for the surrounding uses. The Village Nurseries business will be consolidated from its current location to a smaller portion of the site and will also not result in a changed visual character.

The proposed RV Storage facility includes the installation of approximately eight ft. high ornamental fencing along the residential properties as well as a five foot wide landscape buffer. To minimize the view impacts to the residences, the proponent proposes to install intensified landscaping material to grow through the fencing and the residential units are currently surrounded by an existing six foot high masonry wall. While large profile recreational vehicles including motor homes and boats may be present on site, the landscape buffer and eight ft. high ornamental fence will serve to screen the view of the vehicles. Additionally, the site is only minimally visible from the surrounding public street system on Ward Street and the primary view of the property is currently large SCE towers. No chain-link fencing is proposed.

One 480 sq. ft. modular office building with a maximum height of 18'-6" is proposed to be centrally located on the RV storage property and is not anticipated to result in view impacts to the residents. Increased landscaping is proposed at the entry of the RV facility, concentrated along Ward Avenue, in front of the security gate and fencing system. Less than significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The site is presently occupied by the Ellis Substation and Village Nurseries Landscape Center. The proposed RV facility will introduce security lighting along the perimeter of the facility. The proposed lighting uses "Dark Sky" technology that is designed to direct light down toward the ground and prevent light spillage onto the adjacent residential properties. The project will be subject to compliance with City codes

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

requiring that lighting be shielded and directed so as to prevent glare and spillage onto adjacent residential properties. No significant impacts are anticipated.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a) – d) The project is not located in the vicinity of any known archeological, historic or other cultural resource. The site does not include any historic structures, no archaeological or paleontological resources have been identified, and the site has previously been disturbed and graded. No impacts are anticipated.

XV. RECREATION. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project consists entirely of low-level commercial development and existing utilities. No residential uses are proposed. There are fewer employees anticipated with the new RV facility than with the existing nursery. Consequently, no increase in resident or daytime population with the potential to significantly impact use of parks or other recreational facilities would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The specific plan does not include any recreational facilities or directly require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The RV storage project will be subject to payment of the City's park fee pursuant to the HBZSO. Payment of the park fee is considered a fair share contribution towards the development of additional recreational facilities in the City and serves to offset any project impacts.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Discussion: The project includes development of a RV Storage facility on a site currently developed with an electric substation and landscape nursery. No existing recreational opportunities exist on the site and none will be affected by the proposed project. The site is adjacent to Arevalos Park to the south and a bicycle and walking trail at the top of the slope to the east along the Santa Ana River Channel. The proposed project will not interfere with the existing recreational trail and will not impede access to the trail as none currently exists within the project site. Two SCE towers are located between the proposed RV storage lot and Arevalos Park and serve as a buffer between the two uses. During construction of the RV storage lot, all construction materials and equipment will be contained with the project site area although construction noise may be a temporary impact to Arevalos Park. Due to the short two month construction duration, less than significant impacts are anticipated.

XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)
- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)
- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 4, 10)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

Discussion: a) – c) The project site does not serve as farmland and is not identified as farmland on the State's Important Farmlands map. The project will not impact property that was used for agriculture in the past, nor could the subject site be potentially utilized for agricultural purposes in the future based on its current residential zoning designation and utility and landscape nursery use. No impacts are anticipated.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project is not situated within or in the vicinity of a wildlife resource habitat. As analyzed in this initial study, the project is located in areas previously developed that do not support any unique, sensitive, or endangered species. No impacts to any habitat or wildlife area are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1-24) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: No impacts beyond those anticipated in the General Plan DEIR, which considers the potential cumulative impacts of projects anticipated under the current General Plan Land Use designations, are expected. Although the zoning of the site is proposed to change from Residential Low Density to Specific Plan No. 16, the General Plan land use designation will remain Public. The proposed specific plan overlay will limit permitted uses to four specific uses: electrical substation and utilities, landscape nursery, recreational vehicle storage, and wireless communication facilities. The project is proposed in an urbanized area with limited development potential. Consequently, no significant cumulative impact resulting from the proposed project when viewed in connection with probable future projects is anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1-24) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As discussed above in Sections I through XVI, no significant impacts that may cause substantial adverse effects on humans, associated with the project, are anticipated.

XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Huntington Beach General Plan	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
2	City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance	"
3	City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code	"
4	Project Vicinity Maps	See Attachment #1
5	Reduced Project Plans	See Attachment #2
6	Project Narrative	See Attachment #3
7	City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report	City of Huntington Beach Planning Dept., Planning/Zoning Information Counter, 3 rd Floor 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach
8	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (February 18, 2004)	"
9	CEQA Air Quality Handbook South Coast Air Quality Management District (1993)	"
10	City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook	"
11	Trip Generation Handbook, 7 th Edition, Institute of Traffic Engineers	"
12	Airport Environs Land Use Plan for Joint Forces Training Base Los Alamitos (Oct. 17, 2002)	"
13	Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List	"
14	State Seismic Hazard Zones Map	"

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
---------------------------	------------------------------	--

15	Huntington Beach Water Master Plan, December 2000	"
16	City of Huntington Beach Emergency Management Plan	"
17	Limited Geotechnical Investigation and Feasibility Percolation Study for Proposed RV Parking prepared by TGR Geotechnical, Inc. (August 17, 2009)	"
18	Results of Fairy Shrimp Habitat Assessment prepared by Bonterra Consulting (December 1, 2009)	"
19	Preliminary WQMP prepared by Blue Peak Engineering, Inc. (August 10, 2009)	"
20	Preliminary Hydrology Study prepared by Blue Peak Engineering, Inc. (August 10, 2009)	"
21	Ur URBEMIS Air Quality Assessment (December 2009)	"
22	Door King Traffic Counter Anaheim RV Storage Facility (July 2009)	"
23	Draft Ward Garfield Specific Plan No. 16	"
23	City Policies, Standard Plans and Code Requirements	Attachment #4